

STONE PULPIT, EARLY ENGLISH PERIOD.

[CIRCA 1170.]



EARLY ENGLISH STONE PULPITS.

IN the course of a recent notice of proceedings in Chester we promised a view of the Early English pulpit in the Refectory there;—one of the very few remaining examples of pulpits of that era. By a rare accident, however, the drawing of it when put on the wood was not reversed, and the engraving was therefore made to show it on the north side of the refectory instead of the south. We had in consequence abandoned the idea of publishing it, but being pressed by some of our correspondents to keep the promise, we now give it, not as a view of the Chester pulpit, although it really is so with the exception mentioned, but simply as an example of a stone pulpit in the Early English style.

The steps, it will be seen, are formed in the thickness of the wall, and the pulpit is corbelled out. The width of the stairs is 2 feet 8 inches. The height of each opening to apex 7 feet 6 inches, and the floor of the pulpit is 4 feet 3 inches from the ground.*

* The details of this interesting specimen are given in Mr. Dollman's "Examples of Ancient Pulpits," published by G. Bell.

MATERIALS FOR BUILDING WORKS.

THE durability of materials employed in building works is a question too little attended to; the present cost, alas, deludes the majority of those whose province is to decide in these matters. Quantity for money is the popular mania, in the stead of quality, which our forefathers loved. The builders of the 19th century may carry the palm far above all preceding time for gigantic and rapidly-conceived and executed works, but those who follow us will find out many secrets arising out of this rapid and cheap style of building. But the topic I wish now to fix attention to more particularly is the very great neglect of attention in selecting the best materials for the character of any proposed work: when I use the term best, I mean best for its use consistent with durability, economy, and good taste: these conditions, in my opinion, should be sought to be combined as much as possible. The architect has a noble field in aiming to design an effective, economical, and durable building. I will now advert to two or three illustrations of my argument as to the selection of materials.

In the recently-published Blackwall Railway report, the parapet walls enclosing the sides of the railway are said to have cost above 2,600*l*. The purpose of these walls is sufficiently obvious now that locomotives are employed, but why

brick walls were resorted to is not so obvious,—the iron rods and standards forming the original fence are built in: the contriver of this work surely forgot the important principle of the expansion and contraction of iron-work under different conditions of the thermometer. Again, the constant expense of keeping the joints of a 9-inch wall pointed up on both sides would have seemed a strong reason why another method of enclosure should have been sought out.

Most of our railway companies will find out by bitter experience the ultimate cost of wooden erections: miles of upright matched boarding have been fixed during the last five years on the sides of the platforms at the various stations. Travelling the other day on the North Kent line, I observed (at Woolwich, I think) thin deal close-boarded fencing, and fir posts and rails, being fixed. What will be the ultimate cost of these fences, kept painted on both sides; and how many years will these fences last? Speaking of fences, I will also advert to one, now almost prostrate, in the new Victoria-park, near Hackney: fir posts have been used, and they have rotted off at the level of the ground, as might have been expected. Now, this fencing cannot have been put up more than three years;—is not this a miserable waste of public money? A vast deal has been ex-